24 September 2023

The South Hams Society Interest

For the last 60 years, the South Hams Society has been stimulating public interest and care for the beauty, history and character of the South Hams. We encourage high standards of planning and architecture that respect the character of the area. We aim to secure the protection and improvement of the landscape, features of historic interest and public amenity and to promote the conservation of the South Hams as a living, working environment. We take the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty very seriously and work hard to increase people's knowledge and appreciation of our precious environment. We support the right development - in the right places - and oppose inappropriate development.

Permitted Development Rights

1. Do you agree that prior approvals for design or external appearance in existing permitted development rights should be replaced by consideration of design codes where they are in place locally?

No, at least not where the change of use from agricultural buildings to residential in Part 3, Class Q. is concerned. It is highly unlikely that any local authority will have the time or the financial resources to prepare location-specific design codes applicable to specific countryside locations, and what might be appropriate in a town might not be in the countryside.

2. Do you think that any of the proposed changes to permitted development rights in relation to design codes could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Yes, local planning authorities will be unable to control development that although appropriate in one location might be inappropriate in another. It is also noticeable that the National Design Guide makes no obvious reference to agricultural locations and were the proposed changes to be implemented both community involvement and local oversight will be noticeably reduced.

3. Do you agree that the permitted development right for the change of use from the Commercial, Business and Service use class (Use Class E) to residential (Class MA of Part 3), should be amended to either:

There should be no change to the permitted development right. Removing the limit or merely doubling the amount of floorspace that can change without local authority approval could radically change not only the setting but also the make-up of the community and potentially adversely impact on existing businesses dependent upon custom from the existing commercial use of the site.

4. Do you agree that the permitted development right (Class MA of Part 3) should be amended to remove the requirement that the premises must be vacant for at least three continuous months immediately prior to the date of the application for prior approval?

Not if changes are to be made to the existing permitted development right increasing or even removing entirely the amount of floorspace that can change without local authority approval.

5. Do you think that the permitted development right (Class MA of Part 3) should apply in other excluded article 2(3) land?

No. Within protected landscapes house prices are often such that developers take every opportunity to convert pubs, shops and other community facilities to residential dwellings, often emasculating the community itself. Local communities must retain control over such matters if they are to both survive and thrive.

6. Do you think the prior approval that allows for the local consideration of the impacts of the change of use of the ground floor in conservation areas on the character or sustainability of the conservation is working well in practice?

Yes

7. Do you agree that permitted development rights should support the change of use of hotels, boarding houses or guest houses (Use Class C1) to dwellinghouses?

The answer to this question is similar to that given in 5) above. In the South Hams we have previously seen the development of former hotels in to apartments that have then been sold off as second homes which when coupled with a rise in the number of boarding houses and guest houses becoming holiday lets and AirB&B's, has resulted in local employment opportunities being lost. Again, any such change must be subject to local authority approval.

8. Are there any safeguards or specific matters that should be considered if the change of use of hotels, boarding houses or guest houses (Use Class C1) to dwellinghouses was supported through permitted development rights?

Yes. Loss of local employment opportunities. The imposition of a primary residence requirement. At least 50% of the dwellings created should be genuinely affordable to those earning the local average wage.

9. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class MA permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

The changes will clearly impact over the level of control the local planning authority is able to exercise over development in its locality. It could also noticeably change the character and make-up of communities.

10. Do you think that changes to Class MA will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?

Almost certainly as it will permit developments that would otherwise conflict with both Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies.

11. Do you agree that the right for the change of use from hot food takeaways, betting offices, pay day loan shops and launderettes (Class M of Part 3) is amended to:

It would be hard to argue against doubling the floorspace for all these categories other than launderettes that in many places (for example Totnes) still remain important community facilities.

12. Do you agree that the existing right (Class M of Part 3) is amended to no longer apply to launderettes?

Yes – see 11) above

13. Do you agree that the right for the change of use from amusement arcades and centres, and casinos (Class N of Part 3) is amended to:

Remove the limit

14. Do you agree that the right (Class M of Part 3) should be amended to replace the existing date on which the building must have been in use as a hot food takeaway, betting office, pay day loan shop or launderette instead to a two-year rolling requirement?

The danger of any change is that a developer would first attempt to change the usage of an existing retail premise to one of the listed categories in order to then, two years later, simply profit from the proposed amendment. Arguably there should be no change.

15. Do you agree that the right (Class N of Part 3) should be amended to replace the existing date on which the building must have been in use as an amusement arcade or centre, or casino instead to two-year rolling requirement?

Again, the same caveat as per 14) applies.

16. Do you think that the permitted development right for the change of use from hot food takeaways, betting offices, pay day loan shops and launderette (Class M of Part 3) should apply in other article 2(3) land?

No, not in the case of hot food takeaways and launderettes, without consideration by the local planning authority.

17. Do you think that the permitted development right for the change of use of amusement arcade or centre, or casino (Class N of Part 3) should apply in other excluded article 2(3) land?

No, not in the case of hot food takeaways and launderettes, without consideration by the local planning authority.

18. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class M and N permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Yes. Protected landscapes are often tourist hotspots and hot food takeaways, launderettes, amusement arcades and casinos can be important visitor facilities and attractions, as well as providing vital local employment opportunities. Again the local planning authority and the local community should be able to determine whether or not those businesses should remain.

19. Do you think that changes to Class M and N will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?

As with 10) above almost certainly, as it could permit developments that would otherwise conflict with both Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies.

20. Do you agree that the right (Class G of Part 3) is expanded to allow for mixed use residential above other existing uses?

Yes, provided the dwellings delivered provide genuinely affordable homes.

21. Do you agree that the number of flats that may be delivered under the right (Class G of Part 3) is doubled from two to four?

Yes, provided the dwellings delivered provide genuinely affordable homes.

22. Do you agree that the permitted development right (Class H of Part 3) is amended to align with any changes made to the uses to which Class G of Part 3 applies?

Yes

23. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class G and H permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Some retail businesses might sacrifice some retail or storage space that could adversely impact upon the viability of the business in order to profit from converting that space to residential. Similarly landlords should not be allowed to benefit from the proposed changes without the agreement of their retail tenants

24. Do you think that changes to Class G will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?

Only in the sense that it might speed up development.

25. Do you agree that the smaller and larger home size limits within the agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses right (Class Q of Part 3) should be replaced with a single maximum floorspace limit of either:

Any change should only be with the agreement of both the local planning authority and the local community and subject to both Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies. The need here in the South Hams is for genuinely affordable housing, not for more open-market homes, while increasing the number of homes that can be built in the countryside will inevitably increase demands on local infrastructure and the congestion and pollution of the local highway system.

Class Q Agricultural Buildings to Dwellinghouses has been misused and exploited in the South Hams with agricultural buildings unfit to convert with no structural integrity, and in locations where there is no safe pedestrian access on the road network to the nearest community facilities or to the nearest bus stop. The only safe way out is by vehicle. Many barns are now located in unsustainable isolated field locations.

An inappropriately located barn (off a dangerous section of main road).

Further examples follow and rather than modify this class, there should be a review. The climate emergency requires us to change our behaviour and to stop building in unsustainable locations.

The dangerous section main A379 road, nearest bus stop located up this hill.

Wood framed Milk Parlour, repaired and closed with new boarding to gain Class Q permitted development rights.

But only one end and side. The other end of the shed (wooden structure) has collapsed.

As of 16th September 2023. The conversion of a barn?

Another example – Class Q barn to be converted just outside Stokenham.

The conversion in progress? The countryside is left as a building site without permission in a location where development would not be permitted (South Devon AONB).

26. Do you agree that an overall limit on the amount of floorspace that can change use, set at 1,000 square metres, should be introduced for the agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses right (Class Q of Part 3)?

No. The majority of these modern large barns are poorly located, remote from facilities and, by definition, any such proposal will further increase changes to the character and appearance of our protected landscape.

27. Do you agree that the 5 home limit within the agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses right (Class Q of Part 3) should be increased to allow up to a total of 10 homes to be delivered within an agricultural unit?

No. Any such change will do nothing to either conserve or enhance any protected landscape.

28. Do you agree that the permitted development right for the change of use from agricultural buildings to residential use (Class Q of Part 3) should be amended to allow for an extension to be erected as part of the change of use on previously developed land?

No. Were there to be a building say 10 metres long and four metres deep sited on a hard standing of sufficient size, the existing floor area might be thought too small to provide anything other than accommodation for an agricultural worker. The changes proposed would effectively double the available ground floor area to 80m2. The increased size could change the character and appearance of the setting and should therefore be subject to a planning application.

29. Do you agree that a prior approval be introduced, allowing for the consideration of the impacts of an extension on the amenity of neighbouring premises, including overlooking, privacy and light?

Yes.

30. Do you agree that buildings should have an existing floorspace of at least 37 square metres to benefit from the right?

Yes.

31. Do you think that the permitted development right for the change of use from agricultural buildings to residential use (Part 3 Class Q) should be amended to apply in other article 2(3) land?

No. Currently planning consent goes with the land, not with the applicant, and there is no requirement for the LPA to be informed of any change of ownership. As a consequence, an agricultural need may have been demonstrated and consent obtained subject to a condition imposed because:

It is considered necessary to restrict the use of the building to agricultural uses only and that it is removed if no longer required in this way, as the development is considered acceptable for the use proposed in a countryside location, and is permitted on the basis of an agricultural need without which permission would not have been granted.

However the site can then be sold to a new owner with or without the building having already been constructed, and the LPA will have no guaranteed way of knowing whether that condition is being adhered to.

To quote a case in point: on 25 July 2022 the South Hams District Council gave approval to an application to erect a general purpose agricultural building on an 8.34 acre site

at Barberry Farm, Dittisham (Application Reference 1767/22/FUL).

According to Rendalls, the agent for the applicant, the applicant had owned the land 'for one year after moving to the area and also grazes an additional 30 acres (not 30ha as stated in the Officer Report) of neighbouring land which is rented'.

At the time it was said the applicant was the owner of 25 breeding ewes and 30 pygmy goats. The building, Rendalls said, was required to 'store machinery and fodder, as well as to house ewes during lambing. The building would provide a dry place for the ewes to lamb and also a safe space to store the fodder and machinery and keep it from becoming weather damaged, as replacing any of this would be costly for the applicant.'

Condition 6 of the Decision Notice made it clear that:

> ***'The development is considered acceptable for the use proposed in a countryside location, and is permitted on the basis of an established agricultural need without which permission would not have been granted.'***

and if the building was no longer required for agricultural purposes it would need to be removed.

Now, little more than 12 months later, the land is on the market through Luscombe Maye with a guide price of £195,000 and being sold as 'A unique opportunity to acquire approximately 8.34 acres of permanent pasture and woodland with planning consent for a general-purpose agricultural building situated in a secluded location near to the desirable village of Dittisham'.

Almost certainly, if the changes being proposed were to be extended to protected landscapes such as the South Hams they would inevitably be exploited to the detriment of the locality and the local community.

Changing planning consent from going with the land to going with the applicant, and so ensuring that any new owner would be required to submit a fresh application, would be a possible solution.

32. Do you agree that the right be amended to apply to other buildings on agricultural units that may not have been solely used for agricultural purposes?

No – in protected landscapes it is important that the LPA is able to maintain as much control as possible over proposed developments. The South Hams has seen a proliferation of barn structures in the countryside, very often to justify new housing to come shortly after.

33. Are there any specific uses that you think should benefit from the right?

To provide genuinely affordable accommodation in sustainable locations where there is a clearly demonstrable and well-established local need.

34. Are there any specific uses that you think should not benefit from the right?

All uses other than the provision of genuinely affordable accommodation in sustainable locations where there is a clearly demonstrable and well-established local need.

35. Do you agree that the right be amended to apply to agricultural buildings that are no longer part of an agricultural unit?

No – a full planning application should continue to be required.

36. Do you agree that any existing building must already have an existing suitable access to a public highway to benefit from the right?

Yes.

37. Do you have a view on whether any changes are required to the scope of the building operations permitted by the right?

It is important, certainly within protected landscapes, for the LPA to continue to be able to control the appearance of a building's windows, doors, roofs and exterior walls while the environmental impact of water usage and proposed drainage systems need also to be evaluated.

38. Do you have a view on whether the current planning practice guidance in respect of the change of use of agricultural buildings to residential use should be amended?

Yes – the local planning authority should be given greater control over such changes, not less.

39. Do you agree that permitted development rights should support the change of use of buildings in other predominantly rural uses to residential?

No – throughout the South Hams there are many equestrian developments, a number of which already conflict with the published AONB Planning Guidance (page 106) that has found:

> ***Intrusive recreational horse keeping is cluttering the agricultural landscape in some places with structures, riding areas, fencing, new tracks, external lighting and parked vehicles and trailers;***

Were many of those owners to be given the option to profit from converting those structures to residential dwellings they undoubtedly would. However many would be unlikely to give up wishing to continue to keep horses. As a result they would either endeavour to erect new stables on their existing property or else purchase new land, so helping to drive up the price of agricultural land, making it unaffordable to farmers, and seek to change its usage to equestrian. Not only would this further clutter the countryside to the detriment of the landscape but it would also take more land out of food production, so threatening food security.

40. Are there any safeguards or specific matters that should be considered if the right is extended to apply to buildings in other predominantly rural uses?

Given both the need and requirement to both conserve and enhance protected landscapes the right should not be extended but rather the local planning authority should be given greater, and not less, control.

41. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class Q permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Tourism and hospitality offer by far and away the most important economic consideration in the South Hams, with visitors being attracted by the beauty of our coastline and countryside and the character and vibrancy of our market towns. By reducing local authority control over what development can take place the government runs the risk of making the area a less attractive destination. Similarly too many existing residents are forced to commute by car to places of employment. The proposed changes will inevitably result in yet more unsustainable development throughout the countryside. And without a provision to ensure that any new dwellings are genuinely affordable too many will be occupied either by incomers looking for somewhere to retire, so further exacerbating the existing demands on local services, or else by second-home owners.

42. Do you think that changes to Class Q will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?

The changes may result in the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application, given that many may not have received planning consent, being in conflict with existing local and neighbourhood plan policies. Control needs to remain with the community and local planning authorities.

43. Do you agree that permitted development rights should support the change of use of other buildings in a predominantly rural land use to a flexible commercial use?

No. It is important to consider, for example, the highways implications of converting an agricultural storage barn to, say, office accommodation and the increase in vehicle traffic that might arise as a consequence, and its impact on the amenity of the local community.

44. Do you agree that the right be amended to allow for buildings and land within its curtilage to be used for outdoor sports, recreation or fitness?

No. The impact on the amenity of the local community has to be taken in to consideration by the local planning authority.

45. Do you agree that the right be amended to allow buildings to change use to general industrial, limited to only allow the processing of raw goods produced on the site and which are to be sold on the site, excluding livestock?

Yes.

46. Should the right allow for the change of uses to any other flexible commercial uses?

No. The impact on the amenity of the local community has to be weighed by the local planning authority against the claimed support to the rural economy.

47. Do you agree that the right be amended to allow for a mix of the permitted uses?

No. Not without the impact of the proposed changes being fully evaluate by the local planning authority – changing a group of agricultural buildings to a farm shop and hotel could have significant highways implications along with detrimental environmental implications and an adverse impact on the amenity of the local community.

48. Do you agree that the right be amended to increase the total amount of floorspace that can change use to 1,000 square metres?

No – again for the reasons listed under 47 above.

49. Is the trigger as to whether prior approval is for required set at the right level (150 square metres)?

Arguably it is too high – local planning authorities and residents should have greater, and certainly not less, control over what happens in their communities.

50. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class R permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Yes. Local planning authorities and communities will lose yet more control over the development that can be inflicted on them, notwithstanding any policies detail in local or neighbourhood plan.

An example of Class R permitted development. How does a system of permitted development allow this to be suitable for conversion to other business uses in a field?

Class R: The Barn at Ringmore, Kingsbridge, Devon, TQ7 4HW

On the next page, photographs of the signals office at the wartime RAF Bolt Head. Stated to be a barn, after four attempts of obtaining planning permission for conversion to residential dwelling all refused, application 3164/21/PAU (Notification of proposed change of use under Class R of agricultural building to flexible commercial use - Business Use (B1)) was successful. Prior Approval was given for Agricultural Building change of use to A1 A2 A3 B1 B8 C1 D2.

The signals office at the wartime RAF Bolt Head.

51. Do you agree that the ground area limit of new buildings or extensions erected under the right be increased from 1,000 to 1,500 square metres?

No, certainly not in protected landscapes and in other areas only with the agreement of the community and the local planning authority.

52. Do you agree that we remove the flexibility for extensions and the erection of new buildings where there is a designated scheduled monument?

Yes, should you proceed to introduce the flexibility in the first place.

53. Do you agree that the right be amended to allow extensions of up to 25% above the original building cubic content?

No. Any need to do so should first be established with the local planning authority.

54. Do you agree that the right be amended to allow the ground area of any building extended to reach 1,250 square metres?

No. Any need to do so should first be established with the local planning authority.

55. Do you agree that we remove the flexibility for extensions where there is a designated scheduled monument?

Yes, should you proceed to introduce the flexibility in the first place.

56. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Part 6 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Yes. As with so many of these proposals the changes will do little or nothing to either conserve or enhance our protected landscapes, enhance biodiversity, reduce emissions and congestion, satisfy the demand for genuinely affordable housing, and help mitigate climate change.

57. Do you agree that the maximum floorspace limit for the extension or alteration to a Commercial, Business and Service establishment on non-protected land is increased to either 200 square metres or a 100% increase over the original building, whichever is lesser?

No. It is important that local planning authorities are able to retain as much control over development in their communities as possible.

58. Do you agree that the maximum floorspace of a new industrial and/or warehousing building on non-protected land permitted under the Part 7 Class H permitted development right be amended to 400 square metres?

No, not if the resulting development would be out of scale and keeping with its surroundings.

59. Do you agree that the maximum floorspace of a new industrial and/or warehousing extension on non-protected land be increased to either 1,500 square metres or a 75% increase over the original building, whichever is lesser.

No, not if the resulting development would be out of scale and keeping with its surroundings.

60. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Part 7 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Inevitably they will impact on all parties. There would be no point in making them should they have no impact. The question is surely whether those, or any other of the proposed changes, are desirable. And, certainly within the South Hams, and for the reasons given, very largely they are not.

61. Do you agree that the permitted development right for the temporary use of land should be amended so that markets can operate either:

C: There should be no change without the agreement of both the local community and the local planning authority, with any possible adverse impact on local amenity being fully assessed.

62. Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Part 4 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Such changes will almost certainly result in increased noise, litter, pollution and congestion, as well as possibly be damaging to the trade of existing local businesses. Consequently any changes need to be approved by both the local community affected and the local planning authority.

63. Do you agree that the existing Class M of Part 7 permitted development right is amended to additionally apply to open prisons?

No – it is entirely wrong that the Ministry of Justice will simply be able to significantly increase the capacity of an open prison without the agreement of the local community.

64. Do you agree that there should be a prior notification process where the development under the Class M of Part 7 right is being used for open prisons?

Yes – see Q.63

65. Do you think that the proposed changes to the Class M of Part 7 permitted development right in relation to open prisons could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Yes. Inevitably in the case of communities. Possibly in the case of tourism and hospitality businesses should visitors be discouraged.

66. Do you think that the changes proposed in this consultation could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).

No view.

67. What guidance, policy, or legislative changes could help to provide a more supportive framework for planning authorities to determine planning applications within?

Trying to impose 'one size fits all' legislation to provide a more supportive framework for planning authorities to determine planning applications within is arguably counter productive. Each application should be judged purely on its merits and its ability to satisfy local and neighbourhood plan policies.

To quote a statement made by the current Secretary of State in the House of Commons on 6 December 2022:

I will increase community protections afforded by a neighbourhood plan against developer appeals—increasing those protections from two years to five years. The power of local and neighbourhood plans will be enhanced by the Bill; and this will be underpinned further through this commitment.

The changes being proposed in this consultation will only diminish the power of local and neighbourhood plans and are clearly in conflict with the minister's stated intention.

68. What new permitted development rights, or amendments to existing permitted development rights, would streamline and simplify the process? If referring to an existing permitted development right, please be as specific as possible.

In too many instances applicants are allowed to ride roughshod over their local communities and the local planning process by exploiting PDR to force through often substandard accommodation and development, to the detriment of residents and their immediate neighbourhoods. Far from enhancing local democracy they are increasingly being used as a method to obtain development without any proper consideration of environmental harm, resulting in substandard development through a tick box exercise. PDR's should be scrapped as unfit for purpose.

69. Would a specific and focused permitted development right expedite or resolve a specific delivery challenge for nutrient mitigation schemes?

Population growth (including housebuilding) is not sustainable in the long term. There are finite resources within the United Kingdom's landscape. Spending vast sums of money very often fails. Take for example South West Water investment (Clean Sweep 1992-2011):

'When South West Water was privatised in 1989, the raw sewage from half a million residents in our region (and more in the tourist season) was being discharged untreated into the sea. Since then our Clean Sweep programme has transformed bathing water quality in the South West by investing over £2 billion in sewerage and sewage treatment infrastructure. This includes over 200 million gallons of new

storm water storage to limit the operation of Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs)'.

And the result:

'South West Water (SWW) has been fined more than £2 million for a series of environmental offences across Devon and Cornwall spanning a period of four years.

It is the largest ever fine imposed for environmental offences in the region.

Delivering her sentence, District Judge Matson said 'incidents of pollution will no longer be tolerated by these courts' and fined the water company £2,150,000 today (26 April 2023)'.

That is the 161st time South West Water has been fined over the last 10 years, costing the company a total of £4,573,634. Before Judge Matson each offense was only costing South West Water on average £15,150. No wonder the fines never worked.

Were further proof needed, compare and contrast:

2012: DEFRA
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/82602/consult-udwp-doc-20121120.pdf

'Tackling water pollution from the urban environment Consultation on a strategy to address diffuse water pollution from the built environment November 2012'

'Currently, 27% of water bodies in England meet the standards necessary to support viable ecosystems. There are already plans and measures in place to address the cause of many water body failures which result from a range of problems from point source pollution (e.g. sewage treatment) to activities related to farming. However, many failures are due to urban and other non-agricultural diffuse pollution where we believe positive action is necessary to improve knowledge, encourage cooperation, perhaps refine regulations and plan investment. We believe cleaning-up our polluted urban rivers will deliver significant benefits by making our towns and cities more attractive, healthy places for people and wildlife and will contribute towards the Government's growth and localism agenda'.

2023: DEFRA
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/state-of-the-water-environment-indicator-b3-supporting-evidence/state-of-the-water-environment-indicator-b3-supporting-evidence

'Research and analysis - State of the water environment indicator B3: supporting evidence Updated 22 May 2023'

'Rivers - 14% of assessed rivers are at good ecological status'.

'The government yesterday announced plans it said would drive down nutrient pollution while allowing new homes to be built, by requiring water companies to upgrade their water treatment works to the highest possible standards by 2030, and by requiring Natural England to create a Nutrient Mitigation Scheme which housebuilders can pay into to offset nutrient pollution from their developments'.

It is likely that any Nutrient Mitigation Scheme will fail while, if past experince is any guide, the Government is being unduly optimistic in expecting the water companies to stop polluting our waters and make them fit for purpose.

70. Please provide specific case studies (including planning reference numbers where available) which can help us understand what issues farmers and land managers are facing in relation to nature-based solutions.

–

71. Would these issues be resolved by amending planning practice guidance or permitted development rights, or any other solutions?

No.

72. Are there any success stories that we can learn from on individual cases, or in certain local planning authorities?

–

73. Would you propose different solutions for different sized agricultural units?

–

74. Do you foresee any unintended negative consequences that may result from more nature-based solutions coming forward (e.g., impacts to other species, flood risk, wildfire risk, risk to public safety, releasing contaminants from contaminated land or hydrology etc.)? How could these be avoided?

Each nature base solution would need to be analysed individually.